



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

6n
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,717	08/15/2001	John M. Packes JR.	00-065	2438

22927 7590 07/16/2003

WALKER DIGITAL
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK
STAMFORD, CT 06905

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PARADISO, JOHN ROGER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3721

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,717	PACKES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Paradiso	3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-15 and 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-15 and 18-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. eIDS submitted 11/11/2002 has been considered and the references cited thereby.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 line 3, claim 11 line 2, and claim 24 line 3, the “automated session” is undefined.

In claim 10 line 3, the “lottery server” is undefined. If the “server” is for/from a computer, Examiner notes that no provision to connect to a computer network is recited in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1-9 and 11-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by ADAMS (US 5848932).

ADAMS discloses a method comprising [a gaming machine] receiving data indicating a request by a player for an automated [gaming] session via actuator (50) (see ADAMS 3:55-60); the limiting criteria (i.e., number of outcomes) causes the automated session to terminate; and the player is informed of the outcome. (See ADAMS column 3 lines 52-57, column 4 lines 17-33, and Figure 1.)

Note that the claimed “lottery outcome” is being read on the random outcome of the wheel (70) of ADAMS.

Art Unit: 3721

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 10, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ADAMS.

ADAMS discloses a method, as described above.

ADAMS does not disclose receiving or transmitting the results of the "automated session" via server, internet, or wireless communication.

However, the use of networks (including the internet) to connect players with the results of their play is notoriously well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a server to the invention of ADAMS to increase the game owner's information regarding the game outcomes and to give the invention of ADAMS an IP address and/or a wireless means of communication so it can be accessed remotely and/or over the internet, thus increasing the convenience to players.

Reference Citations

9. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

- PLACE ET AL discloses a method of initiating a game session when a predetermined event occurs; also a CPU-controlled method.
- BAERLOCHER ET AL discloses a method of initiating a game session with multiple plays possible.
- CELONA discloses a method of connecting games over a network.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Paradiso. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday, 9:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at the number listed below.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Technology Center receptionist.


Examiner John Paradiso: (703) 308-2825

May 1, 2003

Additional Phone Numbers

Supervisor Rinaldi Rada: (703) 308-2187
Receptionist: (703) 308-1148
Customer Service: (703) 872-9301

Fax (Direct to Examiner): (703) 746-3253
Fax (TC 3700 Official): (703) 872-9302
Fax (TC 3700 After Final): (703) 872-9303